

REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 1-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application No. US 2002/0078581 A1 (“*Nejad-Sattari*”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,786,568 to Schulte et al. (“*Schulte*”). The present response is believed to be wholly responsive to each of the issues raised in the Office Action.

I. Drawings Issues

Applicant has cancelled claims 21 and 22. Accordingly, the drawing correction required by Paragraph 2 of the Office Action is not required. Applicant submits herewith corrected drawings for Figs. 1-3, as per the requirement of Paragraph 1 of the Office Action.

II. Claim Rejections

Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 12, and dependent claims 6-8, 16-18 and 23-24 to further clarify her invention.

Claims 1 and 12, as amended, recite a noteworthy feature of the invention, namely that each of the first and second bars are made of one of a semi-rigid or a rigid material, and are substantially transparent.

Applicant reiterates her arguments made in the prior Amendment dated November 7, 2003 regarding the lack of motivation to combine *Nejad-Sattari* with *Schulte*. Nonetheless, even if such a combination were legitimate, and Applicant asserts that it is not, it would not teach all of the elements of independent claims 1 and 12, as amended. In particular, the feature that each of the first and second bars are made of one of a semi-rigid or a rigid material, and are substantially transparent, is neither taught nor suggested by either reference or by their combination.

In fact, in the Office Action the Examiner noted that Applicant's argument that *Schulte* does not teach using rods [now referred to as "bars" in the claims] may be persuasive if a structural limitation was presented that would structurally prohibit the threads of *Schulte* from being broadly interpreted to read on the bars of the present invention. Applicant has now presented such limitation.

The remaining claims are each dependent upon independent claims 1 or 12, and are therefore patentable over the cited prior art for similar reasons, although each reciting additional novel aspects.

No additional fees are believed due herewith. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee(s) deemed necessary to Deposit Account No. 50-0540. Early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Aaron S. Haleva
Reg. No. 44,733
Tel. (212) 715-7773
Fax (212) 715-8000

Dated: August 10, 2004
KRAMER LEVIN
NAFTALIS & FRANKEL LLP
919 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10022